University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2018-2019 Meeting #27, Tuesday, April 23, 2019

Present: Benedum, Brandt (w/o vote), Bridges, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Grieb (Vice Chair), Jeffery, Johnson (Chair), Keim, Kern, Kirchmeier, Laggis, Lambeth, Lee, Lee-Painter, Mirkouei (for McKellar, Idaho Falls, w/o vote), Morgan, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Wiencek, Wiest. Absent: Chopin, Ellison, King, Luckhart, McKellar (Idaho Falls), Raja. Guests: 9

Call to Order and Minutes. The chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm. A motion to approve the minutes (Lee-Painter/Dezzani) passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report.

- The chair asked for a moment of silence in memory of Robert D. (Rob) Hampton who passed away recently. Rob served the University of Idaho as a custodian foreperson in Building Operations.
- The Benefit Audit process is moving forward. Some concerns have been raised to Faculty Senate Leadership and have been forwarded to HR. We are encouraged by the responses we are receiving from Brandi Terwilliger (Director of HR) and Brian Foisy (Vice President for Finance and Administration). If you have concerns or hear of them, please be sure to reach out to Brandi or bring the issue to the attention of senate leadership. Please note that there are multiple methods to provide proof of benefit status. Also note that the information form provided by HR is critical to the process.
- Fourth Annual Active Learning Symposium - The fourth annual Active Learning Symposium will be held Tuesday, April 30, on the first and fourth floors of the Idaho Commons, Moscow. Breakfast will be served at 8 a.m. and sessions will run from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
- Final scheduled meeting for 2018-19 Faculty Senate April 30 will convene after conclusion of first meeting of 2019-20 Faculty Senate which is taking nominations for Chair and Vice Chair.
- University Faculty Meeting will be 3 p.m. Pacific time/4 p.m. Mountain time Wednesday, May 1. Statewide locations: Twin Falls — B-66; Boise — 248A; Coeur d’Alene — 145C; Idaho Falls — TAB 350; and Moscow — Vandal Ballroom, Bruce M. Pitman Center. Some items on the agenda require a quorum.

Provost Report.

1. The provost is cautiously optimistic about student enrollment for fall 2019. He cautioned that we could still experience “summer melt” – that is a decreased enrollment yield as students change their minds about attending over the summer months. Nonetheless, registrations are up by 15% compared to last year. UIdaho Bound participation is also up 15%. Finally, housing deposits are up 15%. The consistency in these numbers is encouraging. The provost reminded senators that UI is fully participating in the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) program for the upcoming year. He also stressed that the university has improved its outreach and marketing. In addition to these encouraging numbers for the upcoming year, students participating in the university’s “Sneak Peak” program doubled this year compared to last year. The Sneak Peak program targets high school juniors who are expected to enroll in fall 2020.
2. The UI tuition request to the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) was approved as requested. This year, the SBOE bundled the tuition requests of all of the four-year institutions into a single motion for approval.

3. As a result of the approval of the university’s tuition request, the plan for FY2020 Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) can go forward without revision. The provost reminded senators that the staff and faculty CEC systems are different. While both staff and faculty compensation are market compensation systems there are significant differences. 50% of CEC for faculty will be allocated at the discretion of the deans. At least 10% is designated for performance. The remaining funds may be used by deans to address compression, equity and to meet important college objectives. Staff compensation is determined on a more formulaic basis and a much smaller amount has been set aside for performance compensation. The differences have led to a sense that less money was available for staff salary increases compared to faculty increases. The provost assured senators that the same percentage of CEC is being applied to both the staff and faculty compensation systems.

4. The university continues to experience financial problems. A memo explaining the issues will be distributed campus-wide in the near future. In short, the university has $7 million in additional expenses. The primary reason for this is that state appropriations for our benefits program have been reduced. UI’s appropriation is tied to the appropriation for all state employees. In addition to the campus-wide memo, an open forum is also planned. Incoming President Green plans to assemble a working group to address the issues.

A senator asked whether the university has established the timeline for faculty to reach 100% of their target salaries. The provost responded that the time to reach target will be based on the resources available. He believes that at current resource levels, it could take a substantial period of time for faculty to reach their target salaries.

Proposed Tenure and Promotion Procedure. Chair Johnson introduced the proposal for discussion by noting that the draft being presented to senate was prepared by Secretary Brandt in collaboration with Vice Provost for Faculty Torrey Lawrence. Brandt and Lawrence will present the proposal.

Brandt called senators’ attention to the White Paper explaining the reasons for the proposal. Along with the white paper is a clean version of the proposal. A redline will be available later. Brandt explained that the proposal is to create a completely new section of the Faculty-Staff Handbook. However, in drafting the new section language was first moved from existing policies on tenure, promotion and on the Professional Portfolio. Once existing language was moved to the new policy it was edited. When the redline is made available, senators will see comments denoting the original location of the language and will see the redlined revisions. Brandt encouraged senators to first consider the new policy from a broad perspective before delving into the specific redline revisions.

In response to questions from senators, Brandt explained that feedback and suggestions from unit administrators, deans and faculty senate would be incorporated into the draft policy. Lawrence stated that early in fall 2019, the draft will be circulated more broadly to faculty for questions and answers either through college faculty meetings or through open fora. After receiving feedback and
making any further revisions, FAC will consider and vote on the proposal and forward it to Senate. The goal is to adopt the proposal so that it will become effective in January 2020.

Brandt explained the proposal section by section.

The first section deals with the provost’s responsibilities. This section retains existing policy authorizing the provost to adopt guidelines to implement the policy. During the discussion a senator commented that he had sometimes found the provost’s guidelines to be inconsistent with language in the *Faculty-Staff Handbook*. He also suggested that it might be appropriate to call attention to the provost guidelines throughout the policy where relevant. In addition to the provost guidelines, Brandt pointed out that a new provision is being proposed that would allow the provost to appoint tenure and promotion committee members if a unit administrator or dean are unable to make an appointment that is consistent with the policy.

The second section of the proposed policy deals with the schedules for tenure and promotion. The proposal is aimed at eliminating ambiguities in current policy. It provides for tenure during the 6th full year of service. It also provides for promotion from instructor to senior instructor during the 6th full year of service. This timing for instructors differs from current policy which provides for promotion of instructors during the third full year. Brandt explained that the third year review provisions are extended to instructors under the draft policy. Lawrence pointed out that previously instructors did not get formal feedback on their progress towards promotion. This change now allows for a true third year review with promotion in the 6th. She encouraged senators to think carefully about whether this change is appropriate.

The draft policy provides for promotion from assistant to associate professor at the time of tenure (6th full year of service) or during the 6th full year of service. The proposal provides for promotion from associate professor to full professor during the 6th year in rank. This provision clarifies current policy which provides ambiguously for a large window of time to go up to full professor. The new proposal further provides that if a faculty member is unsuccessful in being promoted to full professor, she or he may be considered again for promotion in five years. This provision also is a change from current policy which permits an unsuccessful candidate for promotion to full professor to seek promotion again within five years. Several faculty members expressed concern about the revision of the reconsideration time frame. They prefer a more flexible time frame. Another senator was concerned that the five year waiting period was too long.

Also covered in the second section of the proposed policy are provisions for special circumstances that may impact the schedule for tenure and promotion and the process for obtaining extensions of the time for tenure and promotion. Special Circumstances include such matters as transfer between UI units, appointment as an administrator, initial appointment with credit toward tenure and/or promotion and initial appointment with tenure. These provisions are currently scattered across two different UI policies and have been unified in one place in the proposal. In general, the approach of the proposed policy is that impact of such situations on tenure and/or promotion must be worked out with the faculty member in advance and be approved by the provost in writing. Brandt pointed out that further revision is needed to clarify the impact of credit toward tenure and promotion at the time of appointment.
A senator asked for clarification on whether the proposal requires associate professors to go up for promotion to full professor in the 6th full year. Brandt responded that earlier drafts had included such a requirement, but FAC and others who reviewed the early draft expressed concern over the requirement. FAC recommended that the requirement be removed from the proposal so as not to distract from the core purpose of revising the tenure and promotion procedures.

A senator asked for clarification on how the proposal applies to term faculty members. Brandt responded that the proposal is a single unified process for both tenure-track faculty and for term faculty. Term faculty either hold the ranks of instructor or one of the various professor ranks (e.g. research professor, clinical professor, librarian with rank of professor, etc.) Those in all the various professorial ranks would be subject to the procedures for assistant, associate and full professors. Vice Chair Grieb reminded senators that a revision of the policy on faculty ranks was presented earlier to senate for discussion.

A senator asked how the provisions for advance approval in the special circumstances would be enforced. Brandt responded that enforcement is dependent upon the provost. However, she added that the policy clarifies the process, makes the policy more accessible (by grouping all the special circumstance provisions in one place) and provides a framework for consultation with the provost regarding such changes. Lawrence added that in any case, faculty would be no worse off under the proposed revision than they are currently given the ambiguity and gaps in current policy.

The proposal does not change the grounds for obtaining an extension in the timelines for tenure and promotion. However, it clarifies that the extension procedure applies both to tenure and promotion and also provides that if a faculty member obtains an extension for the third year review, the faculty member automatically has a similar extension in the time for tenure.

Finally, a senator raised concern that the only required evidence of effective teaching and advising is student evaluations of teaching. She suggested that additional information such as peer reviews of teaching be included. Provost Wienczek responded that a number of groups such as the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) are already looking at how to address this issue. Brandt and Lawrence also pointed out that the issue has come before FAC. Both Brandt and Lawrence suggested that the discussion of how to evaluate teaching and advising be taken up separately from the current proposal. If an approach to expand evaluation of teaching and advising is adopted, the process can be revised to encompass the new approach.

The third section of the policy establishes a new tenure and promotion “dossier” that includes all of the information to be considered in evaluating each faculty member. She pointed out that the policy clearly delineates which portions of the dossier are to be provided by the professor and which are to be provided by the unit administrator. She also pointed out that the proposal eliminates the practice of creating a “supplemental” file that is physically located in the unit office. Brandt explained that this practice is most likely the result of times past when the physical size of each tenure file limited the information that could be forwarded from the unit to higher levels of review. She also pointed out that the unit administrators have already identified some issues with the proposal as drafted such as how to handle books that are not available in digital form.

The third section of the proposal also contains the provisions for peer review. Brandt pointed out that the proposal limits the requirement for peer review to faculty with responsibility for scholarship
and creative activity. In addition, the proposal expressly prohibits asking peer reviewers to give an opinion on whether a candidate meets the tenure and promotion standards at the reviewer’s institution. UI faculty are not subject to the differing standards of other institutions and are not in a position to prepare a file that addresses such unknown standards. Asking this question introduces the possibility of negative information in a file on matters that are outside the scope of the UI’s tenure and promotion review. Brandt pointed out that after the unit administrator discussion of this provision, it is clear that more guidance on peer reviews, particularly relating to conflict of interest and the qualifications of international reviewers, is needed.

Brandt then pointed out that the proposal contains new provisions establishing a strict time-line. It requires that dossiers be submitted prior to materials being sent to external reviewers or prior to the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled, whichever is earlier. Once a dossier is submitted, the proposal provides that it is final and cannot be changed. A dossier cannot be withdrawn from the process without the approval of the provost. Finally, consideration is not final until the president has acted on the application for tenure and/or promotion.

A senator asked when a dossier is considered submitted. Brandt acknowledged that the current proposal is unclear on this issue and needs revision. Lawrence stated that currently faculty sign a document of submission which could be incorporated into the policy so that there is a date certain for submission.

A senator asked whether the proposed policy is eliminating the requirement that the faculty candidate draft a document reviewing his or her evidence of accomplishment. Brandt responded that this was not the intention. The proposal retains both the personal context statement and the personal philosophy statement which are the same documents as currently required. The senator offered her view that clarification and specific direction about the content of these two documents would be helpful. A number of senators asked how the policy would impact departmental practices regarding external peer review. Both Lawrence and Brandt explained that the goal of the policy was to have a single system for peer reviews at the university level that is workable for all units.

A senator asked what reports would be included in the dossier. For example, he asked whether the third year review would be included for a faculty member going from associate professor to full professor. Brandt responded that the proposal is that all prior reports and responses are included. A number of senators expressed concern that an old mediocre or poor review should not be included where a faculty member has subsequently demonstrated success in their areas of responsibility. The suggestion was made that older records that predate the most recent review should not be included in the dossier.

The fourth section of the policy governs third year review. It provides that all faculty have a third year review, in contrast to current policy which appears to only require such a review for tenure-track faculty. The proposal also provides for a three-person committee with slightly different composition depending on whether the faculty member under review is term or tenure-track.

A senator expressed concern that the third year review is limited to a three-person committee. He stated that in his unit, the entire department participates in the third year review. This broad participation is undertaken to ensure that the faculty member being reviewed has a full understanding of departmental expectations. A senator suggested that the proposal could be revised
to require that the third year review committee have “at least” three members. This would provide for departmental variation.

Another senator asked why the proposal did not provide that the third year review committee be a standing committee. She asked whether the intent was that a different third year review committee be established for each faculty candidate? Brandt responded that the proposal was drafted to permit the establishment of a unique committee for each faculty member. This would allow units with broad variation in substantive expertise to tailor the review committee to the faculty candidate. However, a single third year review committee for all candidates would also be permissible under the proposal.

Brandt then addressed the fifth section of the policy dealing with unit, college and university committees. She stated that the goal of the process was to provide a clear and manageable committee structure. She also noted that the composition of the university-level committee remains the same as current policy, but that the role of the committee is expanded to consider both tenure and promotion. Finally, she pointed out that the policy formalizes a process that has been followed by Provost Wiencek and President Staben wherein the provost writes a report setting forth the reasons for his recommendations.

A senator asked whether unit faculty comments accompanying the polling results are forwarded to the college and university. Brandt responded that the proposal would need to be clarified to provide for this.

The chair closed the meeting by thanking the faculty secretary and others who have worked on the policy draft. He encouraged senators to circulated the draft widely and to provide comments and feedback to the faculty secretary and the vice provost for faculty.

The time for the meeting having expired, a motion (Morgan/McKellar) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt,
Faculty Secretary & Secretary to the Faculty Senate